

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

CHARLES L. EDWARDS,

*Plaintiff,*

*v.*

NEW HAVEN PROBATE COURT, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

Civil No. 3:14cv710 (JBA)

December 22, 2014

**RULING ON OBJECTION TO THE RECOMMENDED RULING OF DISMISSAL  
AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Plaintiff Charles L. Edwards objects [Doc. # 8] to the Recommended Ruling of Dismissal [Doc. # 7] and has filed [Doc. # 9] a “Motion to amended[,] also motion of summary judgment and motion to award.” For the reasons that follow, Plaintiff’s objection is overruled, his motion is denied, and this case is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim.

In the Recommended Ruling, Judge Margolis recommended that the Court dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim, because this case “bears similarity to the twelve previous lawsuits initiated by plaintiff pro se, all of which have been dismissed” and here Plaintiff “once again, fails to state a

coherent basis for his Complaint.”<sup>1</sup> (Recommended Ruling at 2–3.) As the Recommended Ruling notes, Plaintiff does not purport to state any legally recognized causes of action, but rather in hand-written entries on the District’s standardized Complaint Form, he wrote for Claim I: “Bipolar Affective Disorder” and for Claim II: “Paranoid Schizophrenia” and “he is delusional.” (Compl. [Doc. # 1] at 3–4.) Mr. Edwards attaches to the Complaint a copy of his involuntary civil confinement order, dated June 13, 2013, and numerous other unrelated attachments, including a Wikipedia article, the Rules of the Supreme Court, and numerous published judicial opinions.

Plaintiff’s Objection to the Recommended Ruling does not discuss the merits of the Recommended Ruling or his Complaint at all, but just quotes unidentified legal standards and cases and attaches numerous judicial decisions on a range of topics. Likewise, Plaintiff’s “Motion to amended[,] also motion of summary judgment and motion to award” does not set forth any basis for amending the complaint or elaborate on any coherent claims and the memorandum in support of this motion appears to be entirely composed of quotations from unspecified judicial opinions. (See Pl.’s Mem. Supp. Mots. [Doc. # 13].)

---

<sup>1</sup> The Complaint acknowledges that at least one of these cases, *Edwards v. State of Connecticut, et al.*, 12cv1743 (AWT), “deal[t] with the same facts involved in this action.” (Compl. at 4.) In that case, the court dismissed Mr. Edwards’s complaint in which he described being restrained and apprehended on the New Haven Green and involuntary confined and medicated. The court noted that the allegations were “incomprehensible” and failed to state a claim for relief. *Edwards*, 12cv1743, Recommended Ruling of Dismissal [Doc. # 10], *approved and adopted by* Order [Doc. # 26]. It also noted that in one of Plaintiff’s twelve other lawsuits filed in federal court since 1991 involving similar claims, he had been unable to state a claim for relief even with the assistance of appointed pro bono counsel. See *Edwards v. Jean-Baptiste*, No. 3:08-CV-01720PCD, 2009 WL 1870868, at \*1 (D. Conn. June 25, 2009).

Because the Complaint does not state any comprehensible claims for relief, Defendant's Objection [Doc. # 8] is OVERRULED, the Recommended Ruling of Dismissal [Doc. # 7] is APPROVED AND ADOPTED, and Plaintiff's Motion [Doc. # 9] is DENIED. The Complaint is DISMISSED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The Clerk is directed to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/  
Janet Bond Arterton, U.S.D.J.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut this 22nd day of December, 2014.